

PART IV - REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

M.1	EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS.....	M-2
M.2	BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD.....	M-3
M.3	OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	M-4
M.4	TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	M-4
M.5	COST AND PRICE EVALUATION CRITERIA	M-7
M.6	FAR 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JULY 1990).....	M-8

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

- (a) Proposals will be evaluated by the Government in accordance with the applicable procedures contained in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15 and Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR) Part 915 and the Evaluation Criteria hereinafter described. DOE has established a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) to evaluate the proposals submitted for this acquisition.
- (b) The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award one contract to a single Offeror. The Government intends to make award without discussions, although it may clarify proposals as allowed in FAR 15.306(a). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from both a technical and cost/price standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary.
- (c) A proposal will be eliminated from further consideration before the initial evaluation if the proposal is so grossly and obviously deficient as to be totally unacceptable on its face. For example, a proposal will be deemed unacceptable if it does not represent a reasonable initial effort to address itself to the essential requirements of the RFP, or if it clearly demonstrates that the Offeror does not understand the requirements of the RFP. In the event that a proposal is rejected, a notice will be sent to the Offeror stating the reason(s) that the proposal will not be considered for further evaluation under this solicitation.
- (d) The instructions set forth in Section L of this Request for Proposal (RFP) are designed to provide guidance to the Offeror concerning the documentation that will be evaluated by the SEB. The Offeror must furnish specific information in its response to address the evaluation factors in detail and as instructed. Cursory responses that merely repeat or reformulate the Statement of Work are not acceptable.
- (e) Prior to award, a determination will be made regarding whether any possible Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) exist with respect to the apparent successful Offeror or whether there is little or no likelihood that such conflict exists. In making this determination, the Contracting Officer (CO) will consider the representation required by Section K of this solicitation. An award will be made if there is no OCI or if any potential OCI can be appropriately avoided or mitigated.
- (f) For the purpose of evaluating information on an Offeror's experience and past performance, an Offeror shall be defined as those companies that have established business arrangements or relationships for this solicitation, including subcontractors that will perform major aspects of the Performance Work Statement (for subcontracts equal to \$5 million or more.)

- (g) For the purpose of evaluating Offeror's experience and/or past performance, the SEB may contact some or all of the references provided by the Offeror, and may solicit past performance information from other available sources. These include Federal Government electronic databases, readily available Government records (including pertinent prime contracts), and other sources other than those identified by the Offeror.
- (h) Any exceptions or deviations to the terms and conditions of the contract may make the offer unacceptable for award without discussions. If an Offeror proposes exceptions to the terms and conditions of the contract, the Government may make an award without discussions to another Offeror that did not take exception to the terms and conditions of the contract.
- (i) If a competitive range is established pursuant to FAR 15.306(c), Offerors are hereby advised that only the most highly rated proposals deemed to have a reasonable chance for award of a contract may be included in the competitive range. Offerors that are not included in the competitive range will be promptly notified.

M.2 BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD

- (a) DOE intends to award **a hybrid contract that includes a Firm-Fixed Price with Award Fee CLINs, a Cost Reimbursement with no fee CLINs, and Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity CLINs** to the Offeror whose proposal is responsive to the solicitation and determined to be the best value to the Government. Selection of the best value to the Government will be achieved through a process of evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each Offeror's proposal in accordance with the Technical Evaluation Factors.
- (b) In determining best value to the Government, the Technical Evaluation Factors are significantly more important than evaluated price. The Government is more concerned with obtaining a superior technical proposal than making an award at the lowest evaluated price. Thus, the closer or more similar in merit that the Offerors' technical proposals are evaluated to be the more likely the evaluated price may be the determining factor in selection for award. However, the Government will not make an award at a price premium it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the evaluated superiority of one technical proposal over another. Evaluated price will not be point scored or adjectively rated. The Government will assess whether the strengths and weaknesses between or among competing technical proposals indicate superiority from the standpoint of:
 - (1) What the difference might mean in terms of anticipated performance; and
 - (2) What the evaluated price to the Government would be to take advantage of the difference.

M.3 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The technical evaluation criteria are listed below and will be evaluated using adjectival ratings. Criterion 1 and Criterion 2 are equal in importance, and when combined are significantly more important than the combined Criterion 3 and Criterion 4. Criterion 3 and Criterion 4 are equal in importance.

- Criterion 1 - Past Performance
- Criterion 2 - Key Personnel and Organization
- Criterion 3 - Technical Approach
- Criterion 4 - Corporate Experience

M.4 TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

1) CRITERION 1 – PAST PERFORMANCE (Evaluated based on written proposal and other sources)

DOE will evaluate relevant (similar in size, scope and complexity) past performance information for the Offeror, teaming partner(s), and/or major subcontractor(s) for the same three contracts identified for corporate experience.

The Offeror's and its teaming partners, as well as major subcontractors' past performance will be evaluated on the basis of information furnished by the references identified in Section L and any other available sources. DOE will evaluate the quality of performance relative to the scope, size, and complexity to the work described in the solicitation. DOE will consider in its evaluation the degree of relevance, of the Offeror's past performance information. In the case of a newly formed joint venture, DOE will evaluate the past performance of each member that comprises the newly formed entity, including the past performance for the work proposed to be performed by each entity under the solicitation/PWS as well as past performance in managing and performing the overall work under the solicitation/PWS. DOE will evaluate major subcontractor(s) past performance commensurate with the portion of the work being performed under the solicitation/PWS.

DOE will evaluate information regarding past performance (if obtained) from independent data as well as data provided by offerors. DOE may check readily available Government records including pertinent DOE prime contracts, or from commercial references for relevant past performance information. If an Offeror is a newly formed entity the past performance of the Offeror's parent organization or LLC members will be evaluated.

DOE will review all information submitted and may contact some or all of the contract references provided by the Offeror. References other than those identified by the Offeror may be contacted and be considered by the Government regarding the evaluation of the Offeror's past performance. At the CO's discretion, the DOE may

choose to consider questionnaires that arrive subsequent to the closing date of the RFP if such consideration does not unduly delay the evaluation.

In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance, it will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably.

2) CRITERION 2- KEY PERSONNEL AND ORGANIZATION (Evaluated based on written proposal and oral presentation)

Key Personnel -Written Information:

The Offeror will be evaluated on the Key Personnel it proposes and considers to be essential to the successful accomplishment of the work being performed under the contract. The Key Personnel will be evaluated for demonstrated leadership; demonstrated experience in performing work similar in size and complexity to the PWS; and qualifications (e.g. education, certifications, licenses) as presented in the resumes.

The Offeror will be evaluated on its designation of Key Personnel positions relative to the approach to the management and execution of the work proposed by the Offeror. DOE will evaluate the rationale and selection of the Key Personnel. The evaluation will also include an assessment as to whether the Offeror has proposed the appropriate Key Personnel team, with the appropriate mix of Key Personnel positions and skills for successful performance.

DOE will evaluate the experience of each Offeror's key personnel as it relates to providing occupational medical services and effective management of worker health and treatment of illness and injury, specifically in regard to experience with industrial, construction, environmental cleanup, analytical laboratory, and research laboratory settings where exposures and hazards are associated with such environments, including hazardous/toxic waste, biological agents, beryllium, and radioactive materials including forms of uranium, plutonium, and other transuranic materials.

DOE will evaluate each Offeror's key personnel through review of written resumes. DOE will evaluate the Key Personnel's education, experience, and demonstrated past performance of the Key Personnel, as well as their suitability to the proposed position, leadership and capability to perform the PWS relevant to their proposed position. DOE will evaluate that each Offeror's key personnel meet the requirements for their specific position as described in the Section H clause entitled, "Qualifications of Key Personnel". DOE will evaluate the Offeror's rationale for the selection of the proposed Key Personnel. In addition to the resumes, references may be contacted.

In evaluating the Key Personnel, the Principal Manager and the Site Occupational Medical Director (SOMD) will be considered more important than other proposed Key Personnel.

Failure to submit resume formats as shown in Attachment L-1 and Commitment Statements for Key Personnel may result in a lower rating.

Key Personnel-Oral Presentation:

DOE will evaluate the Key Personnel leadership, communications, commitment, teamwork, interactions, problem-solving capabilities, and success in applying solutions based on past experience.

DOE will consider the viability of the Offeror's responses, and the quality and effectiveness of communicating the responses.

DOE will also evaluate the management skills of the Principal Manager.

Organization

DOE will evaluate how well the Offeror's proposed approach to the organization and business systems support implementation of the Technical Approach and provide control and accountability to DOE for performance under the contract. DOE will evaluate the Offeror's explanation of its allocation of resources at the multiple sites and authority level of managers. DOE will evaluate the Offeror's proposed organizational chart that includes a complete Staffing Plan; proposed management tools/systems; approach to achieving effective working relationship with other Hanford site prime contractors; and approach to achieving effective communications with external stakeholders.

3) CRITERION 3 - TECHNICAL APPROACH (Evaluation based on written proposal)

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's proposed technical approach to the execution of each of the requirements of the PWS and the feasibility of the approach. DOE will evaluate the Offeror's timeline showing how it will provide the services outlined in this RFP to insure continuous operations of a comprehensive and integrated occupational medical program.

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's proposed approach to providing safe, high quality, efficient, and timely delivery of the required occupational health services.

DOE will evaluate proposed subcontractors performing Beryllium services (e.g., blood work, physical exams and tests, and consultations).

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's transition plan to achieve an efficient, safe, orderly, and timely transition to the fully-operational delivery of required occupational health services and ensure operations are not interrupted.

4) CRITERION 4 - CORPORATE EXPERIENCE (Evaluated based on written proposal)

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's relevant experience in performing work similar in size, scope, complexity, and/or risk to that described in Section C.

Subcontractor and Other Performing Entities Experience. DOE will evaluate the Offeror's relevant experience of any proposed major subcontractors (\$5 million or more) and any other entities that are proposed to perform work under the contract. DOE will evaluate the relevant experience, similar in size, scope, and complexity, in relation to that portion of the PWS proposed to be performed by the subcontractor or other entity.

Newly Formed Entity. If the Offeror is a newly formed entity with no experience, DOE will evaluate the relevant experience for its parent organization(s) or the member organizations in a joint venture, LLC, or other similar entity.

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's success in completing the contracts or activities, including factors that demonstrate the effective and empathic management of worker health; the treatment of illness and injury; the measures of effectiveness; and any improvements implemented in the performance of the work.

M.5 COST AND PRICE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Cost and Price Proposal will not be adjectivally rated, but it will be considered in the overall evaluation of proposals in determining the best value to the Government. The Total Proposed Firm Fixed Price and Total Award Fee for CLINs 001, 004 and 007 and the Cost Reimbursable amount for CLINs 002, 005 and 008 will be added together to compute the overall evaluated price for the contract and used in determining the best value to the Government.

DOE will compare the evaluated price (total for all CLINs excluding CLINs 003, 006 and 009) to the funding profile as set forth in Section L for both the total anticipated contract funding and the anticipated funding by fiscal year. Since the funding is subject to change based on actual appropriation and actual award date of the contract, DOE may make an award to a contractor whose evaluated price differs from the anticipated funding profile.

For CLINs 001,004 and 007 (Firm Fixed Price and Award Fee):

DOE will evaluate each contractor's proposed total firm fixed price and the award fee amount to assess price reasonableness and completeness. The price reasonableness evaluation may include the following:

- Comparison of the contractor's proposed total firm fixed price to other contractor's proposed total firm fixed price.
- Comparison of the proposed total firm fixed price with independent government cost estimates.
- Comparison of the fully-burdened labor rates to other contractor's fully-burdened labor rates.
- Comparison of the fully-burdened labor rates with the independent government cost estimates.

For CLINs 002,005 and 008 (Cost Reimbursable):

DOE will evaluate the contractor's cost proposal to ensure that it includes the DOE provided amounts.

For CLINs 003, 006 and 009 (Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity):

DOE will evaluate each contractor's proposed fully-burdened labor rates to assess price reasonableness and completeness. The price reasonableness evaluation may include the following:

- Comparison of the contractor's proposed fully-burdened labor rates to other contractor's proposed fully-burdened labor rates.
- Comparison of the proposed fully-burdened labor rates with the independent government cost estimates.

M.6 FAR 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JULY 1990)

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).